DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 056 CE 050 143

AUTHOR Gentry, Larry; And Others
TITLE Establishing Service Goals for School Dropouts under the Job Training Partnership Act. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Los Alamitos, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Washington State Dept. of Employment Security, Olympia.
PUB DATE Jan 86
CONTRACT 22-9-230
NOTE 100p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Dropout Programs; Dropouts; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Objectives; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Job Training; Models; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; State Surveys; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Washington

ABSTRACT

The State of Washington commissioned research into various issues involving services to school dropouts under the terms of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Data suggested that each service delivery area (SDA) had its own set of internal dynamics (economic, cultural, demographic variables) that resulted in a characteristic pattern of educational attainment. National data were used in determining that years of school completed is a major determinant of both income and employment. Although Title II-A of JTPA was currently the largest federal program that specifically targets dropouts for participation, other federal and state programs also served dropouts. In addition, local agencies provided training and employment. A process for establishing goals for serving dropouts was implemented; this process defined and counted school dropouts, looked at use of census data, analyzed the data, adjusted baseline goals, and made adjustments for misreporting by participants. The model that was developed indicated that not all dropouts are equally likely to participate in JTPA programs and that SDAs should set goals that reflect the demographic composition of their region. (Appendixes include the demographic adjustment model, SDA adjustment data and goals, and a report on participant-reported education status.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294056

Establishing Service Goals for School Dropouts Under the Job Training Partnership Act

Larry Gentry

SWRL Educational Research and Development

With the technical assistance of Chris Webster, Jackie Campbell, and Ginger Rich of the Washington State Employment Security Department

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.H. Hein

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE050143

SWRL

SWRL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
4665 LAMPSON AVENUE, LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA 90720 TELEPHONE 598-7661 AREA CODE 213 TELEX 65-6319

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ESTABLISHING SERVICE GOALS FOR SCHOOL DROPOUTS UNDER THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

Final Report to the State of Washington
Employment Security Department
Contract No. 22-9-230:
School Dropout Project
January, 1986

by

Larry Gentry

SWRL Educational Research and Development

SWRL PROJECT STAFF:

Barry Bachelor
Aaron Buchanan
Gwen Kaub
Patricia Milazzo
Carol Thomas
Linda Wilson

TASK 2 AUTHOR:

Annie Laurie Armstrong
BGCC, Seattle, WA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Scope of Work	1
I. Equitable Services for Dropouts	2
II. Educational Attainment in Washington	3
III. Income and Employment	9
IV. Public School Dropout Rates	12
V. Federal and State Programs Serving Dropouts	14
VI. Local Programs Serving Dropouts	17
A. Community Colleges	18
B. Public School Programs	22
C. Educational Clinics	24
D. Teenage Parent Programs	27
VII. Special Populations	27
VIII. Establishing Goals for Serving Dropouts	31
A. Defining and Counting School Dropouts	31
B. Use of Census Data	33
C. Analysis of Data	34
D. Adjusting Baseline Goals	40
E. Adjustments for Misreporting by Participants	43
IX. Summary and Recommendations	44
References	47
Appendix A: Demographic Adjustment Model	A-1
Appendix B: SDA Adjustment Data and Goals	B-1
Appendix C: Task 2 Final Report from BGCC	C-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Percent of High School Graduates and Dropouts by SDA	4
2	Dropout Youth in Washington, 1980	6
3	Adult Dropouts in Washington, 1980	8
4	Median Income of Males (25-34) in U.S. by Educational Attainment	10
5	Labor Force Status of Adults in U.S. by Educational Attainment	11
6	Labor Force Status of Out-of-School Washington Youth by Educational Attainment	13
7	Public High School Dropouts by SDA	15
8	High School Diplomas and GEDs Granted by Community Colleges, 1983-84	19
9	Alternative Schools and Programs	23
10	Vocational-Technical Institutes and Skills Centers	25
11	Educational Clinics	26
12	Teenage Parent Programs	28
13	Estimates of the Disadvantaged Dropout Population by SDA, 1984	35
14	Selected Characteristics of National and Local Dropouts Below the Poverty Line	37
15	Computation of Baseline Goal for Dropouts	39
16	Alternate Dropout Goals Elicited by Static and Flexible Models	41

SCHOOL DROPOUT PROJECT: FINAL REPORT

Scope of Work

In June 1985, the state of Washington's Employment Security Department commissioned SWRL Educational Research and Development to conduct research into various issues involving services to school dropouts under the terms of the Job Training Partnership Act. This document provides a summary of the findings produced by that research and presents concomitant recommendations for JTPA planning and practice.

The Employment Security Department's Contract No. 22-9-230 called for the completion of four tasks. Those tasks, and SWRL's subsequent disposition of them, are as follows:

Task 1: Interim Report and Recommendations

SWRL's document entitled School Dropout Project: Interim Report was submitted on September 17, 1985. The present document expands and, in some cases, modifies the information contained in the Interim Report.

Task 2: Survey of Participant Reported Education Status

This task was subcontracted to BGCC of Seattle, Washington, and was completed in November 1985. BGCC's findings and recommendations are included in this report and their final report to SWRL is included as an appendix to this document.

Task 3: Calculate SDA Dropout Goals

Our recommendations regarding the calculation of dropout goals are included in this report and in individual reports to each of the SDAs.

Task 4: Final Report

As required by the work plan, the present report includes a summary of SWRL's fundings regarding possible criteria for adjusting dropout goals and a summary of recommended goals for SDAs. As requested by Employment Security, we have published individual reports for each SDA that address the specific needs, resources, and adjustment criteria for local areas.

I. Equitable Services for Dropouts

Washington's JTPA officials take seriously the federal mandate found in Section 203(b)(3) of the Job Training Partnership Act: ". . . eligible school dropouts shall be served on an equitable basis, taking into account their proportion of economically disadvantaged persons sixteen years of age and over in the area." State and local administrators recognize that individuals with little education and few skills usually face a bleak future and often require a disproportionate share of social and economic assistance. They are committed to rectifying this situation to the best of their ability through job training and placement services.

At the present time, dropout goals for the individual SDAs are determined by (1) estimating the number of economically disadvantaged dropouts in the SDA who are 18 years old and over, and (2) dividing this figure by the total number of economically disadvantaged persons who are 16 years old and over. The resulting figure (the percentage of economically disadvantaged dropouts in the SDA) becomes the baseline percentage goal for the SDA's services to dropouts. Where local administrators present data that warrant a modification of the baseline goal, some adjustment may be considered.

Unfortunately, this procedure does not adequately harmonize with the pragmatic experience encountered in field-level operations. In most SDAs, the percentage of dropout participants is substantially below established goals. While intensive recruiting efforts, incentives and/or disincentives for contractors, and similar attempts to boost dropout participation usually have some positive impact, these activities often

require such a large commitment of time and resources that other aspects of the program suffer. Most local administrators believe that the present goals are unrealistically high.

SWRL has undertaken the task of examining this problem and attempting to find a better, more realistic method of establishing local goals for serving dropouts. To accomplish this task, it was necessary for us to look at several aspects of the dropout situation in Washington and locate those factors that appear to determine participation in JTPA programs.

II. Educational Attainment in Washington

When the educational attainment of Washington residents is compared with that of residents of other states, two general statements appear to be justified: (1) Young people in Washington have a slightly lower high school completion rate than the national average; (2) Adults who are 25 years old and over in Washington are far above the national average in percentage of high school graduates.

Data from the 1980 census indicate that 86.3 percent of the state's 16-21 year-old population have a diploma or its equivalent. This figure places Washington slightly behind the national average of 86.8 percent. Washington's adults do substantially better. In 1980, 78.3 percent of the adult population had at least twelve years of school. This places Washington far ahead of the national average of 68.6 percent.

These figures, however, are of little use in planning for JTPA services. As Table 1 shows, Washington's twelve SDAs vary significantly in educational attainment among both youth and adult populations. In the Eastern SDA, for example, 93.8 percent of youth are high school

TABLE 1

Percent of High School
Graduates and Dropouts by SDA

1980 Census

	Youth (Ages 16-21)		Adults (Ages 25+)	
	Graduates	Dropouts	Graduates	Dropouts
1 Olympic	86.7	13.3	77.9	22.1
2 Pacific Mountain	82.5	17.5	73.0	27.0
3 Northwest	88.2	11.8	77.5	22.5
4 Snohomish	84.0	16.0	78.0	22.0
5 Seattle-King Co.	88.9	11.1	82.6	17.4
6 Tacoma-Pierce Co.	86.1	13.9	76.3	23.7
7 Southwest	82.7	17.3	74.2	25.8
8 Pentad	79.0	21.0	69.1	30.9
9 Tri-Valley	79.0	21.0	63.9	36.1
10 Eastern	93.8	6.2	77.1	22.9
11 B-F-WW	84.8	15.2	78.1	21.9
12 Spokane	88.9	11.1	78.2	21.8
STATE OF WASHINGTON	86.3	13.7	78.3	21.7
UNITED STATES	86.8	13.2	68.6	31.4

graduates; many are students at Washington State University. In the Pentad and Tri-Valley SDAs, two agricultural regions with large migrant populations, the high school completion rate among youth is only 79 percent. Among adults, Seattle-King County shows the highest completion rate (82.6 percent), while in the Tri-Valley SDA, only 63.9 percent have at least twelve years of schooling.

These data suggest that each SDA has its own set of internal dynamics (e.g., economic, cultural, demographic variables) that result in a characteristic pattern of educational attainment. A descriptive analysis of this hypothesis is beyond the scope of this report, but the variables deemed most important for each SDA have been identified and are discussed in the individual planning guides that SWRL has prepared for local use.

One of the major points that we made in our interim report was that, contrary to public opinion, most "dropouts" are not young people, but adults. Nevertheless, most JTPA administrators agree that dropout youth are usually more difficult to train and place than their adult counterparts. There is also no way of avoiding the fact that youth unemployment is a serious problem in most local communities and throughout the nation. As we will point out in a later section, the problem is much more severe among dropouts than among graduates. Thus, it may be helpful to look at some of the demographic variables that have an impact on dropout rates among youth.

Table 2 divides Washington's 16-21 year-old population into three different age groups and shows how dropout rates varied among both age groups and ethnic groups in 1980. As noted at the bottom of the table, the overall dropout rate for youth was 13.8 percent. The youngest

TABLE 2

Dropout Youth (Ages 16-21), 1980

STATE OF WASHINGTON

Race or Ethnic Group	Population	% Among Ethnic Gps.	Dropouts	% Among Ethnic Gps.	Dropout Rate
WHITE					
Ages 16-17	128,508	88.5	12,000	83.4	9.3
Ages 18-19	130,434	88.9	19,821	84.3	15.2
Ages 20-21	130,348	88.4	18,236	81.0	14.0
Total	**389,290**	**88.6**	**50,057**	**82.9**	**12.9**
BLACK					
Ages 16-17	4,166	2.9	336	2.3	8.1
Ages 18-19	3,818	2.6	598	2.5	15.7
Ages 20-21	4,215	2.9	729	3.2	17.3
Total	**12,199**	**2.8**	**1,663**	**2.8**	**13.6**
NATIVE AMERICAN					
Ages 16-17	3,081	2.1	681	4.7	22.1
Ages 18-19	2,636	1.8	852	3.6	32.3
Ages 20-21	2,765	1.9	1,058	4.7	38.3
Total	**8,482**	**1.9**	**2,591**	**4.3**	**30.6**
ASIAN					
Ages 16-17	3,647	2.5	209	1.5	5.7
Ages 18-19	3,979	2.7	393	1.7	9.9
Ages 20-21	4,388	3.0	498	2.2	11.4
Total	**12,014**	**2.7**	**1,100**	**1.8**	**9.2**
HISPANIC					
Ages 16-17	5,540	3.8	1,119	7.8	20.2
Ages 18-19	5,526	3.8	1,787	7.6	32.3
Ages 20-21	5,439	3.7	1,933	8.6	35.4
Total	**16,505**	**3.8**	**4,839**	**8.0**	**29.3**
ALL GROUPS[a]					
Ages 16-17	145,185	100.0	14,382	100.0	9.9
Ages 18-19	146,653	100.0	23,499	100.0	16.0
Ages 20-21	147,435	100.0	22,504	100.0	15.3
Total	**439,273**	**100.0**	**60,385**	**100.0**	**13.8**

[a]Includes individuals classified as "other" racial or ethnic group.

Source: Annual Demographic Information. Washington State Employment Security Department, 1985.

cohort, 16-17 year olds, had a dropout rate of only 9.9 percent. Youth between the ages of 18-19 had the highest incidence of dropout--16.0 percent. The rate drops somewhat for 20-21 year olds (15.3 percent), suggesting that many of those who don't graduate with their class either go back to school or obtain an equivalency certificate (i.e., GED).

In terms of race and ethnicity, non-Hispanic white youth comprised 88.6 percent of the population in 1980, but constituted only 82.9 percent of dropouts. Hispanics, on the other hand, made up only 3.8 percent of the population, but accounted for a full 8.0 percent of dropouts. Hispanics led all other minority groups in the number of dropouts at each age level. Blacks and Asians both had relatively low rates (Asians topped all groups with an overall dropout rate of only 9.2 percent), while Native Americans, like the Hispanics, reported disconcertingly high percentages of dropouts across all age groups.

Table 3 shows the distribution of adult dropouts by ethnic group and by gender. Non-Hispanic whites account for 92.4 percent of the adult population and 89 percent of the dropouts. Although whites far outnumber other groups in the number of dropouts, they have the lowest actual dropout rate at 21.6 percent. As with the youth population, Hispanics have both the largest number of dropouts and the highest dropout rate (44.5 percent) among minority groups.

Overall, there is little difference between males and females in dropout incidence. Among Blacks and Native Americans, however, there is notable propensity for females to leave school before graduation more frequently than males.

TABLE 3

Adult Dropouts (25 and Over), 1980

STATE OF WASHINGTON

Race or Ethnic Group	Population	% Among Ethnic Gps.	Dropouts	% Among Ethnic Gps.	Dropout Rate
WHITE					
Male	1,091,346	92.2	232,452	89.1	21.3
Female	1,161,920	92.5	253,617	88.8	21.8
Total	**2,253,266**	**92.4**	**486,069**	**89.0**	**21.6**
BLACK					
Male	26,357	2.2	6,746	2.6	25.6
Female	22,811	1.8	6,743	2.4	29.6
Total	**49,168**	**2.0**	**13,489**	**2.5**	**27.4**
NATIVE AMERICAN					
Male	13,179	1.1	4,504	1.7	34.2
Female	14,932	1.2	5,846	2.0	39.2
Total	**28,111**	**1.2**	**10,350**	**1.9**	**36.8**
ASIAN					
Male	25,774	2.2	5,408	2.1	21.0
Female	32,637	2.6	9,025	3.2	27.7
Total	**58,411**	**2.4**	**14,433**	**2.6**	**24.7**
HISPANIC					
Male	25,517	2.2	11,504	4.4	45.1
Female	22,771	1.8	10,004	3.5	43.9
Total	**48,288**	**2.0**	**21,508**	**3.9**	**44.5**
ALL GROUPS[a]					
Male	1,183,333	100.0	260,844	100.0	22.0
Female	1,255,970	100.0	285,521	100.0	22.7
Total	**2,439,303**	**100.0**	**546,365**	**100.0**	**22.4**

[a]Includes individuals classified as "other" racial or ethnic group.

Source: Annual Demographic Information. Washington State Employment Security Department, 1985.

III. Income and Employment

Although we were unable to obtain local data pertaining to the relationship between education and income or employment among adults, a number of national surveys conducted by federal agencies indicate that years of school completed is a major determinant of both.

Table 4 shows how graduation from high school or college influences the earnings of males between the ages of 25 and 34. While the linear relationship between education and income is significant but unsurprising, it is noteworthy that, after 1971, the high school diploma became increasingly important. Between 1971 and 1981, the median income of college graduates increased by almost 89 percent, and that of high school graduates increased by 80 percent. However, for those with less than a high school diploma, median income went up by only 52 percent. In 1983, a recession year, small gains were made by both college and high school graduates but dropouts showed a loss from their 1981 incomes.

National data on the employment and unemployment experiences of adults with differing levels of education demonstrate the same pattern. Table 5 reveals that, in March 1985, when the adult (ages 25-64) unemployment rate was 6.1 percent, those with more than 12 years of school had an unemployment rate of only 3.4 percent, high school graduates experienced 6.9 percent, and those with less than 12 years manifested an 11.4 percent rate. Although dropouts made up only 20.3 percent of the working-age population, they accounted for 29.9 percent of the unemployed and 34.2 percent of those not in the labor force.

The 1980 census does provide information on the labor force status of high school graduates and dropouts between the ages of 16 and 21 in Washington. Since high school and college students who are working while

TABLE 4

Median Income of Males (25-34) in the United States by Educational Attainment

Year	Income			Ratio	Ratio
	College Graduates (1)	High School Graduates (2)	Some High School (3)	(1)(2)	(2)(3)
1950	$ 3,510	$ 3,095	$ 2,735	1.13	1.13
1961	6,640	5,175	4,425	1.28	1.17
1971	10,908	8,556	7,331	1.27	1.17
1981	20,589	15,393	11,173	1.34	1.38
1983	21,988	15,789	10,711	1.39	1.47

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Education in the United States: 1940-1983 (Special Demographic Analysis CDS-85-1), 1985.

TABLE 5

Labor Force Status of U.S. Adults (25-64)
by Educational Attainment (March, 1985)

	Level of Attainment							
	Less Than High School		High School Only		More Than High School		Total	
	Number	Pct.	Number	Pct.	Number	Pct.	Number	Pct.
Population	23,539,000	20.3	46,821,000	40.4	45,663,000	39.4	116,023,000	100.0
Civilian Labor Force	14,100,000	15.9	35,541,000	40.2	38,783,000	43.8	88,424,000	100.0
Employed	12,496,000	15.0	33,094,000	39.8	37,470,000	45.1	83,060,000	100.0
Unemployed	1,605,000	29.9	2,446,000	45.6	1,313,000	24.5	5,364,000	100.0
Not in Labor Force	9,439,000	34.2	11,280,000	40.9	6,880,000	24.9	27,599,000	100.0
Labor Force Participation Rate		59.9		75.9		84.9		76.2
Labor Force Unemployment Rate		11.4		6.9		3.4		6.1

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. "Educational Level of U.S. Work Force Up Sharply Over Decade" (Special Labor Day News Release), n.d., 1985.

attending school tend to have different labor market experiences than those engaged in or seeking full-time employment, we have limited our analyses to those who were not enrolled in school at the time of the census.

As Table 6 reveals, approximately 83 percent of non-enrolled high school graduates were in the labor force and only 12.8 percent were unemployed. By way of contrast, 62.6 percent of the dropouts were in the labor force and 27.7 percent were unemployed. Although non-enrolled graduates outnumbered dropouts more than two-to-one, more dropouts than graduates reported that they were not in the labor force (i.e., not working and not looking for work).

IV. Public School Dropout Rates

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction reports that, during the 1982-83 school year, 14,556 Washington students in grades 9-12 dropped out of school. This resulted in a statewide dropout rate of 6.26 percent. While this relatively "low" percentage appears to conflict with the census figures discussed earlier, it should be noted that the SPI data include only those who dropped out of high school during one school year. The census figures, on the other hand, represent the cumulative impact of school-leaving decisions over a number of years.

To illustrate this point, consider the fact that students who dropped out of Washington high schools in 1982-83 were distributed among the various grade levels as follows:

Grade	Enrollment	Dropouts	Percent
9	58,140	2,971	5.11
10	60,760	3,958	6.51
11	56,970	3,992	7.01
12	56,518	3,635	6.43
TOTAL	232,388	14,556	6.26

TABLE 6

Labor Force Status of Out-of-School Youth
(Ages 16-21) by Educational Attainment, 1980*

STATE OF WASHINGTON

	Dropouts		Graduates		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Population	60,385	33.0	122,523	67.0	182,908	100.0
Civilian Labor Force	37,816	27.0	102,041	73.0	139,857	100.0
Employed	27,329	23.5	88,939	76.5	116,268	100.0
Unemployed	10,487	44.5	13,102	55.5	23,589	100.0
Not in Labor Force	22,569	52.4	20,482	47.6	43,051	100.0
Labor Force Participation Rate		62.6		83.3		76.5
Labor Force Unemployment Rate		27.7		12.8		16.9

*Does not include youth who were enrolled in high school or college, regardless of labor force status.

Source: Annual Demographic Information. Washington State Employment Security Department, 1985.

It can be seen that, in order to be counted as a dropout, a student had to be enrolled in a public school at the beginning of the 1982-83 school year. Thus, youngsters of high school age who dropped out earlier and did not re-enroll in 1982 are not included in this count. A rough estimate of the percentage of students who drop out between the 9th grade and graduation can be obtained by multiplying the one-year dropout rate (6.26 percent) by four, thus yielding an estimated four-year rate of 25.0 percent. SPI has not collected dropout data during four consecutive years, thus it cannot be determined how many students from the graduating class of 1983 actually dropped out after entering the 9th grade in 1979.

Table 7 shows how these rates varied in the areas served by Washington's twelve SDAs. Those districts serving the Eastern Washington SDA had both the lowest overall number of dropouts (263) and the lowest dropout rate (4.29 percent). Because of its large population, Seattle-King County had the largest absolute number of dropouts during the year--3,988, but had a lower-than-average dropout rate--6.1 percent. Four SDAs had rates that exceeded 7 percent: Southwest (7.42 percent); Snohomish (7.21 percent); Pentad (7.18 percent); and Tri-Valley (7.04 percent).

V. Federal and State Programs Serving Dropouts

While Title IIA of the Job Training Partnership Act is currently the largest federal program that specifically targets school dropouts for participation, a number of other governmental programs also serve segments of this population. Six such programs are, in fact, funded under other sections of JTPA, and at least three others are operated by state agencies. Among the major federal and state alternatives are the following:

Job Corps. Probably the oldest and most successful of the federal job training programs for disadvantaged youth, Job Corps is now

TABLE 7

Public High School Dropouts by
Service Delivery Area, 1982-1983

SDA #	Name	High School Enrollment	Dropouts	Percent
1	Olympic	12,497	737	5.90
2	Pacific Mountain	18,464	1,114	6.03
3	Northwest	11,626	767	6.60
4	Snohomish	20,033	1,444	7.21
5	Seattle-King County	65,370	3,988	6.10
6	Tacoma-Pierce County	28,077	1,762	6.28
7	Southwest	16,973	1,260	7.42
8	Pentad	10,180	731	7.18
9	Tri-Valley	13,086	921	7.04
10	Eastern	6,131	263	4.29
11	Benton-Franklin-Walla Walla	11,035	562	5.09
12	Spokane	18,916	1,007	5.32
State Total		**232,388**	**14,556**	**6.26**

Source: Dropout Rates and Graduation Statistics for Washington State School Districts: School Year 1982-83. Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1984.

operated under Title IV of JTPA. The program provides vocational training and GED preparation for disadvantaged school dropouts between the ages of 16 and 22. Region X, with headquarters in Seattle, serves slightly more than 2,000 such youth from the State of Washington.

JTPA Education Coordination and Grants. Eight percent of the state's JTPA Title II funds are available to the Governor for assistance to educational agencies for education and training. In Washington, the Governor has identified four target areas for these funds: offenders, limited-English speaking clientele, economic development, and special projects. Among those programs enrolling participants during FY 1984, 429 dropouts were served statewide.

JTPA Programs for Older Individuals. Three percent of the Governor's eight percent set-aside is designated for the training of economically disadvantaged individuals 55 years old and over. We were unable to ascertain the number of dropouts being served under this JTPA Title I program.

JTPA Programs for Dislocated Workers. During 1984-85, Washington's JTPA (Title III) programs for dislocated workers served 6,991 individuals. Of this number, 733 (10.5 percent) were school dropouts. The number of participants from individual SDAs was not available.

JTPA Programs for Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers. Washington Human Development Corporation is the authorized contractor for this JTPA Title IV program. During 1984-85, 1,045 individuals were served in Washington. Of the program's 866 terminees, 534 (61.7 percent) had less than a high school education.

JTPA Programs for Native Americans. We were unable to gather reliable data on the number of dropouts being served under these Title IV programs.

WIN (Work Incentive) Programs. Operated by the Department of Social and Health Services and the Department of Employment Security, WIN assistance is available to AFDC recipients. As of September 30, 1985, there were 18,582 individuals registered for WIN assistance in the state of Washington. Of this number, 6,837 (36.3 percent) had less than 12 years of schooling.

Washington Service Corps. Established in 1983, the Washington Service Corps provided training and employment for 553 young adults between the ages of 18 and 25 during 1984-85. Slightly more than 70, or 13.3 percent of corps members were dropouts.

Washington Ecology Youth Corps. This program enrolls youngsters between the ages of 14 and 17 to remove litter and recycle waste material. Approximately 700 to 800 young people participate each year as employees of the Department of Ecology. Data pertaining to the number of dropouts involved in the program was not available.

VI. Local Programs Serving Dropouts

In addition to federal and state programs that assist school dropouts in obtaining training and employment, there are a number of institutions and organizations in most SDAs that provide educational preparation and/or job training for those lacking a high school diploma. Among the agencies providing such services are community colleges, public alternative schools, vocational training centers, educational clinics, and teenage parent projects.

Some of these programs are potential affiliates for direct recruiting or coordination efforts. Community colleges and vocational training institutes (VTIs), in particular, attract large numbers of adult dropouts through their adult education and skilled occupation classes. In some SDAs, JTPA personnel have made oral presentations to classes, obtained student mailing lists, posted circulars on campus, or otherwise initiated contact with adult dropouts.

Many of the projects listed below, however, are designed to serve "potential" dropouts. According to JTPA criteria, adolescents who are subject to a compulsory education law (under age 18 in Washington) cannot be classified as dropouts. It is probable that most of the students in alternative schools, educational clinics, and teenage-parent programs fall into this latter category. Nevertheless, we are including these youth-oriented programs here for several reasons:

1. We are convinced of the efficacy of dropout prevention programs. Intervention during the high school years is both socially and economically preferable to adult remediation. SDA administrators may wish to explore the possibility of establishing "preemployment skills training" or "education for employment" programs (as outlined in Section 205 of the Act) with appropriate institutions.

2. Unfortunately, youth programs aren't successful with all students; some who enter these projects as "potential" dropouts

eventually become "actual" dropouts. JTPA can offer this latter group a second chance. Alternative school administrators may be willing to refer JTPA-eligible dropouts.

3. Most youth programs accept applicants up to the age of 20. SDA intake-counselors may wish to refer certain applicants to agencies that offer appropriate services (e.g., teenage-parent projects, GED programs).

A. Community Colleges

Eleven of the 12 SDAs have community colleges that offer local residents the opportunity to obtain either a high school diploma or a certificate of equivalency through the General Educational Development (GED) program. The Eastern Washington SDA is the only region not served by at least one community college.

In conjunction with their GED preparation classes and testing programs, the state's community colleges issued 6,994 GED certificates in 1983 (see Table 8). This figure represents almost two-thirds of the 10,606 GEDs awarded in Washington that year. In addition to GED preparation and testing, most community colleges offer two options for students who prefer a high school diploma: (1) a diploma issued by the community college through completion of appropriate courses; (2) a diploma issued by local high schools through transfer of credits earned at the community college. In 1983-84, some 1,178 persons earned diplomas granted by community colleges (see Table 8), and another 1,957 were granted diplomas by high schools on the basis of college credit.

All told, community colleges, other GED test centers, and local high schools accounted for 13,741 "non-traditional" completions in 1983-84. In the publication that reported these statistics (Office of Financial Management, 1984) the authors called attention to the "sharp correspondence" between the number of GEDs issued (10,606) and the number of

TABLE 8

High School Diplomas and GED Certificates
Granted by Community Colleges, 1983-84 by SDA

	SDA	College	Diplomas	GEDs
1	**Olympic**	Olympic	40	532
		Peninsula	--	130
		SDA Total	40	662
2	**Pacific Mountain**	Centralia	34	128
		Garrett Heyns	42	53
		Grays Harbor	10	187
		Olympia Tech	--	104
		So. Puget Sound	34	--
		SDA Total	120	472
3	**Northwest**	Skagit Valley	7	388
		Whatcom	30	137
		SDA Total	37	525
4	**Snohomish**	Edmonds	59	474
		Everett	61	421
		SDA Total	120	895
5	**Seattle-King Co.**	Bellevue	12	162
		Green River	60	320
		Highline	188	173
		Seattle Central	21	175
		Seattle North	28	161
		Seattle South	10	90
		Shoreline	137	85
		SDA Total	456	1,166
6	**Tacoma-Pierce Co.**	Ft. Steilacoom	72	151
		Tacoma	56	341
		SDA Total	128	492
7	**Southwest**	Clark	129	559
		Lower Columbia	65	185
		SDA Total	194	744
8	**Pentad**	Big Bend	--	147
		Wentatchee Valley	15	252
		SDA Total	15	399
9	**Tri-Valley**	Yakima Valley	6	150
10	**Eastern**	None	--	--
11	**B-F-WW**	Columbia Basin	13	356
		Walla Walla	7	268
		SDA Total	20	624
12	**Spokane**	Spokane	--	614
		Spokane Falls	42	251
		SDA Total	42	865
STATE OF WASHINGTON			1,178	6,994

Source: Unpublished data, Washington State Board for Community College Education.

"non-graduating (dropouts) 12th grade students" (9,164) in the 1982-83 school year. They suggest that, "The simultaneous increase in 12th grade dropouts and the number of 18 and 19 year olds receiving GEDs indicates that an increasing number of 12th grade students are dropping out of school and obtaining GEDs" (p. 39).

While the OFM was correct in detecting a trend toward increased use of the GED, their identification of some 9,000 non-graduating seniors as dropouts was hasty. According to dropout and graduation data collected by the Superintendent of Public Instruction (March, 1984), only 3,635 (6.4 percent) of Washington's 12th graders dropped out of school in 1982-83. Another 6,216 seniors were enrolled throughout the year but didn't graduate. It is probable that many of this latter group fell short of graduation requirements but were remaining in school to qualify for a delayed diploma.

The OFM report did, however, point out the significant fact that some 3,370 (31.8 percent) of the GEDs issued in 1983 went to 18-19 year olds. This affirms the notion that many dropouts recognize the importance of high school completion, but are unwilling or unable to accommodate themselves to the norms imposed by traditional schools.

Prior to 1974, Washington youngsters between ages 15-19 were not eligible for a GED certificate unless they needed it to qualify for a job. When the law was liberalized to include those having ". . . a substantial warranted reason for leaving the regular high school program . . ." (WAC 180-56-425), many young people took advantage of this opportunity. As evidenced by the following SPI data, use of the GED option increased steadily until 1981 and then began to decline:

GED Certificates Issued to
18-19 Year-Olds in Washington

Year	Number	Percent Annual Increase
1973	1,082	--
1974	1,290	19.2
1975	1,656	28.4
1976	2,014	21.6
1977	2,108	4.7
1978	2,188	3.8
1979	2,813	28.6
1980	3,567	27.2
1981	4,005	12.3
1982	3,730	-6.9
1983	3,370	-9.7
1984	2,930	-13.1

The decline in GEDs after 1981 is probably due to the "baby-bust" phenomena of the early 1960s (i.e., decrease in births), and a corresponding decrease in total dropouts. Data from SPI show a 10 percent decrease in the high school population between 1977 and 1982. More importantly, in 1978-79, SPI reported 20,732 dropouts--7.96 percent of the fall enrollment in grades 9-12 (Legislative Budget Committee, 1985). As noted earlier in this report, the number of dropouts decreased to 14,556 in 1982-83 (6.26 percent of fall enrollment). Although future trends in GED participation are dependent on a number of social and economic factors, it is likely that the number of young (18-19 year-old) recipients will show some increase over the next few years, reflecting a new cycle of increased high school enrollments that began in 1981.

What proportion of dropouts choose the GED option? According to the 1980 census, there were 23,499 dropouts aged 18-19 in the state of Washington (see Table 2). During that year, 3,567 GEDs were issued in that age group--an estimated 15.2 percent of the dropout population. Since the raw numbers were derived from two unrelated surveys, this is a very rough estimate.

The lack of a high school diploma or GED is one of two major factors necessary in determining classification as a JTPA-eligible dropout. The other factor, of course, is economic status below the poverty line. State-level surveys pertaining to high school dropout data and GED recipients do not identify students by economic status. Thus, the available data do not permit an estimate of the number of disadvantaged GED recipients.

B. Public School Programs

We do know that many students who drop out from their neighborhood schools find a place in public alternative schools. Many of these institutions are designed to provide individualized instruction for students who are experiencing academic or social difficulties in traditional school settings. They usually provide basic skills instruction, counseling, and academic coursework leading to the high school diploma. About 7,400 students were enrolled in Washington's public alternative schools and programs in 1983-84 (see Table 9).

In addition to providing for the academic and social needs of potential dropouts, the state's public school system also offers occupational training through several vocational-technical institutes and vocational skills centers. Washington's five vocational-technical institutes are all located in western, urban areas of the state. While they are organized primarily as post-secondary institutions for adults, VTIs also enroll limited numbers of in-school youth where similar training is not available through local school agencies.

Unlike the VTIs, Washington's seven skills centers are located in various parts of the state and were created to serve the vocational

Table 9

Alternative Schools and Programs for Youth

SDA	School/Program	City	1984 Students	Gds	Characteristics
1 OLYMPIC	Alpha/Omega Project	Bremerton	50	9-12	Suspended or excluded student
	CHOICE Alternative School	Port Angeles	40	9-12	Discipline problems
	Interim School Extended Concept	Silverdale	10-18	9-11	Re-entry, underachievers
	Migrant Education Program	Port Townsend	60	K-12	Correspondence, migrants
	South Kitsap Alternative School	Port Orchard	76	10-12	Potential dropouts
2 PACIFIC MOUNTAIN	Aberdeen Continuation High School	Aberdeen	50	9-12	Dropouts, district referrals
	CHOICE Continuation School	Shelton	40	9-12	Potential dropouts
	Kiwanis Vocational Home School	Centralia	53	7-12	Group home, court placement
	Thurston County Off-Campus School	Olympia	40	9-12	Potential dropouts
	Yelm Extension School	Yelm	60	9-12	Potential dropouts
3 NORTHWEST	LaVenture School	Mount Vernon	90	7-12	Bilingual (Hispanic) tutoring
	South Whidbey High School	Langley	--	9-12	Dropout prevention
4 SNOHOMISH	Alternative Learning Center	Marysville	119	8-12	Dropouts, district referrals
	Mariner H.S. Extended Day Program	Everett	40	10-12	Afternoon, individualized
	Monroe Alternative Educ. H.S.	Monroe	26	9-12	Potential dropouts
	Phoenix Center Alternative School	Everett	320	9-12	Non-traditional, individualiz
	PROVE Alternative High School	Lake Stevens	40	9-12	Dropouts, district referrals
	Scribner Lake School	Lynnwood	200	8-12	Potential dropouts
	Youth Resource Center	Everett	60	8-12	Juvenile court referrals
5 SEATTLE-KING CO.	Auburn Off-Campus School	Auburn	190	9-12	High-risk students
	Bellevue Off-Campus School	Bellevue	250	9-12	Dropouts, high-risk students
	B.E.S.T. High School	Kirkland	125	9-12	Non-traditional, individualize
	Bothell Secondary Alt. School	Bothell	100	9-12	High-risk students
	Contract Based Education	Auburn	80	9-12	Individualized contracts
	Contract High School	Mercer Island	80	9-12	Individualized contracts
	Enumclaw Re-entry School	Enumclaw	45	7-12	Dropouts, district referrals
	Federal Way Continuation H.S.	Auburn	200	9-12	High-risk students
	Highline Satellite School	Seattle	500	7-12	High-risk students
	Interlake High School	Bellevue	49	9-12	Dropout prevention
	Kent Continuation High School	Seattle	140	9-12	Dropouts, district referrals
	Meridian Alternative School	Seattle	100	7-12	Potential dropouts
	Mount Ranier High School	Seattle	36	9-12	Dropout prevention
	Re-entry Alternative H.S.	Issaquah	130	9-12	High-risk students
	Renton Alternative H.S.	Seattle	180	9-12	High-risk students
	Seattle Altern. H.S.--Marshall	Seattle	300	9-12	Dropouts, district referrals
	Seattle Altern. H.S.--Sharples	Seattle	250	9-12	Dropouts, district referrals
6 TACOMA-PIERCE CO	A-1 School	Tacoma	--	10-12	Potential dropouts
	Bethel Alternative High School	Spanaway	125	10-12	Dropout re-entry
	Continuation High School	Puyallup	75	7-12	High-risk students
	GATES Secondary School	Tacoma	200	9-12	High-risk students
	Open DOR Altern. High School	Tacoma	120	10-12	Dropout retrieval
7 SOUTHWEST	Castle Rock High School	Castle Rock	480	9-12	Non-traditional, individual
	Evergreen Alt. Learning Program	Vancouver	150	9-12	Individualized, underachieve
	Natural High School	Longview	100	10-12	Dropouts, district referrals
	Pan Terra Alternative School	Vancouver	95	7-12	High-risk students
8 PENTAD	Columbia Basin Altern. H.S.	Moses Lake	80	9-12	High-risk students
	Lake Roosevelt Altern. H.S.	Coulee Dam	10-20	9-12	Dropouts, District referrals
	Omak Alternative High School	Omak	60	9-12	Dropouts, district referrals
	Wentachee Valley Alterna. H.S.	Wenatchee	New	9-12	High-risk students
9 TRI-VALLEY	Detention Home/Juvenile Facility	Yakima	28	6-12	Group home, court placement
	Ellensburg Alt. Educ. Program	Ellensburg	30	9-12	Dropout re-entry
	Evening Education Program	Yakima	72	9-12	Evening classes
	KEY/OIC	Yakima	24	8-12	GED prep, skills training
	Outreach Program	Yakima	28	7-12	Emotionally handicapped drop
	PACE Alternative High School	Wapato	130	9-12	Dropout re-entry
	The Place	Yakima	60	9-12	Juvenile parole referrals
	Project Reach Out	Yakima	50	8-12	Dropout prevention
	Upstairs School	Yakima	200	8-12	Teenage parents
	Youth Service Center	Yakima	50	7-12	High-risk youth
10 EASTERN	Secondary Alternative Learning Time (SALT)	Colville, Kettle Falls, Newport, Riverside	30 per district	7-12	Dropout Prevention
11 B-F-WW	ALPS Learning Center	Walla Walla	30	7-12	Juvenile court referrals
	(CE)2	Kennewick	20-30	11-12	Individualized career educat
	Minischool, Inc.	Richland	55	7-12	Individualized programs
	Pasco Alternative High School	Pasco	100	9-12	Dropouts, high-risk students
12 SPOKANE	Joseph Jantsch High School	Spokane	450	9-12	High-risk students
	REAL (Regional Educ.ALt.Lab)	Spokane	60	9-12	Dropouts, district referrals
	Spokane Valley Alternative School	Spokane	250	9-12	High-risk students

preparation needs of high school students. They are generally the cooperative enterprise of several different school districts, offering vocational training to students who are still enrolled in academic programs at their local high schools.

While neither vocational training institutes nor skills centers are specifically designed to serve dropouts or potential dropouts, they do serve as a valuable resource for both dropout prevention and re-integration. Many of these institutions have GED programs for non-graduates, child care facilities for teenage parents, job counseling and placement services for students, and other support services often essential to disadvantaged school dropouts. Ten of the twelve SDAs have at least one VTI or skill center (see Table 10). Only the Pentad and Eastern SDAs are without such facilities. The most recent addition to the state's vocational education system is the New Market Vocational Skills Center in Olympia.

C. Educational Clinics

Educational clinics are special-purpose institutions that provide intensive remedial instruction for dropout youth who wish to qualify for GED certification or who want to re-enter a local high school. The clinics are regulated by SPI and the cost of instruction is reimbursed by state funds. At the present time there are 10 clinics in the state, four of which are in Seattle. Approximately 1,400 Washington youth were served by these institutions in 1983-84. Table 11 provides a list of the educational clinics by SDA and locale.

TABLE 10

Vocational-Technical Institutes
and Vocational Skills Centers

	SDA	Institute/Center	City	Enrollment
1	OLYMPIC	Kitsap Peninsula Vocational Skills Center	Bremerton	400
2	PACIFIC MOUNTAIN	New Market Vocational Skills Center	Olympia	New
3	NORTHWEST	Bellingham Vocational-Technical Institute	Bellingham	1,200
4	SNOHOMISH	Sno-Isle Vocational Skills Center	Everett	650
5	SEATTLE-KING CO.	Lake Washington Vocational-Technical Institute	Kirkland	3,100
		Renton Vocational-Technical Institute	Renton	1,200
6	TACOMA-PIERCE CO.	L.H. Bates Vocational-Technical Institute	Tacoma	2,400
		Clover Park Vocational-Technical Institute	Tacoma	3,250
7	SOUTHWEST	Clark County Vocational Skills Center	Vancouver	165
8	PENTAD	None		0
9	TRI-VALLEY	Yakima Vocational Skills Center	Yakima	500
10	EASTERN	None		0
11	B-F-WW	Tri-City Area Vocational Center	Kennewick	175
12	SPOKANE	Spokane Area Vocational Skills Center	Spokane	650

TABLE 11

Educational Clinics

	SDA	Clinic	City	1984 Students
1	OLYMPIC	Madrona House	Bremerton	29
2	PACIFIC MOUNTAIN	Thurston County Off-Campus School	Olympia	30
3	NORTHWEST	None		--
4	SNOHOMISH CO.	Educational Clinics, Inc.	Everett	294
5	SEATTLE-KING CO.	Center for Human Services	Seattle	104
		Seattle Indian Center	Seattle	13
		Seattle OIC	Seattle	43
		United Indians of All Tribes	Seattle	27
6	TACOMA-PIERCE CO.	Educational Clinics, Inc.	Tacoma	743
7	SOUTHWEST	None		--
8	PENTAD	None		--
9	TRI-VALLEY	Yakima Valley OIC	Yakima	61
10	EASTERN	None		--
11	B-F-WW	None		--
12	SPOKANE	Life Skills Training Institute	Spokane	63
			TOTAL	1,407

D. Teenage Parent Programs

The problem of pregnancy among teenagers is rapidly becoming a major social crisis. Early pregnancy is the most common reason that female dropouts give for discontinuing their education. In addition to ending their formal education, many teenage parents embark on a cycle that includes chronic joblessness and dependence on welfare benefits. According to sociologist Annabel Cook of Washington State University (1983), 41 percent of the state's poverty families are headed by women with children under 18.

Programs that assist teenage parents in coping with their new responsibilities, complete work for a high school diploma, and find gainful employment should be encouraged and promoted by local SDAs. Eleven of the 12 SDAs have programs that are specifically designed for teenage parents (see Table 12). The Eastern Washington SDA is the only SDA without such a facility. Most programs are offered in conjunction with local alternative schools or other educational agencies.

VII. Special Populations

Most economically disadvantaged dropouts can be served through traditional JTPA channels. There are, however, certain segments of the population that are largely unavailable to JTPA programs or that require extraordinary services. Although their distribution and local impact differs significantly among SDAs, these groups include military personnel, persons in correctional institutions, the mentally and physically handicapped, non-English speaking immigrants, and undocumented workers.

In 1980, there were approximately 53,000 military personnel stationed in Washington. About 27,000 of these were located in the

TABLE 12

Teenage Parent Programs

	SDA	Program	City	1984 Enrollment
1	OLYMPIA	Bremerton High School	Bremerton	20
2	PACIFIC MOUNTAIN	W.W. Miller High School	Olympia	22
		Yelm Extension School	Yelm	New
3	NORTHWEST	Whatcom County Teenage Parent Program	Bellingham	15
4	SNOHOMISH	Arlington High School	Arlington	New
		IMPACT Program	Everett	30
		Phoenix Center Alternative School	Everett	35
		PROVE Alternative High School	Lake Stevens	12
		Scribner Lake High School	Lynnwood	12
5	SEATTLE-KING CO.	Auburn Off-Campus School	Auburn	24
		Bellevue Off-Campus School	Bellevue	40
		B.E.S.T. High School	Kirkland	20
		Federal Way Continuation H.S.	Auburn	25
		Highline Satellite School	Seattle	10
		Kent Continuation High School	Kent	5
		Renton Alternative High School	Renton	12
		Seattle School District (Teenage Pregnancy and Parenting Program)	Seattle	125
6	TACOMA-PIERCE CO.	A-1 School	Tacoma	50
		Bethel Alternative High School	Spanaway	--
		Continuation High School	Puyallup	--
		GATES Secondary School	Tacoma	30
		Mount Tahoma High School	Tacoma	20
7	SOUTHWEST	Columbia River High School	Vancouver	15
		Evergreen Alternative Learning Program	Vancouver	20
		Mark Morris High School	Longview	25
8	PENTAD	Columbia Basic Alternative H.S.	Moses Lake	New
		Wenatchee Valley Alternative H.S.	Wenatchee	New
9	TRI-VALLEY	PACE Alternative High School	Wapato	10
		Upstairs Schools	Yakima	--
10	EASTERN	None		
11	B-F-WW	Teen Parent Education (Tri-City Area Vocational Center)	Kennewick	35
12	SPOKANE	Joseph Jantsch High School	Spokane	15
		Spokane Valley Alternative H.S.	Spokane	20

Tacoma-Pierce County SDA at Fort Lewis and McChord Air Force Base. Other major concentrations included 8,500 in the Olympic SDA (U.S. Naval facilities at Bremerton, Bangor, and Port Angeles); 5,600 in the Northwest SDA (U.S. Naval Air Station at Oak Harbor); 5,000 in the Seattle-King County SDA (Seattle Naval Base), and 4,000 in the Spokane SDA (Fairchild Air Force Base). As a part of our inquiry, we attempted to obtain educational attainment data from each of the major installations in Washington, but were unsuccessful in doing so. Thus, the number of dropouts in the military population is unknown. Of course, since military personnel generally have full-time service obligations, they are not candidates for JTPA services.

Data from the census indicate that some 104,000 adults were living in group quarters in 1980. Almost 62,000 of these individuals were living in military barracks, college dormitories, living quarters for farm workers, etc. With the exception of the farm worker category, there is no reason to believe that this population contains inordinate numbers of school dropouts. On the other hand, another 43,000 individuals were classified as "inmates," that is, persons residing in correctional institutions, hospitals, institutions for the physically or mentally handicapped, nursing homes, etc. It is likely that relatively large numbers of dropouts are to be found in these settings. According to the Washington State Department of Corrections, for example, 62 percent of adult offenders are school dropouts and do not have either a diploma or a GED certificate (D. J. Carnahan, personal communication, November, 1985). While similar data are not available for other institutionalized populations, the numbers of dropouts may be substantial in some instances. We have identified the major state institutions and programs located in each

SDA and have included this information in our reports to the individual SDAs.

Although firm statistics are not currently available, we suspect that Washington's non-English speaking population probably contains large numbers of educationally disadvantaged persons. In 1980, those who reported that they spoke English poorly or not at all numbered slightly more than 25,000. Given the increased pace of immigration over the past few years, it is likely that this number has now increased substantially. Two SDAs (Seattle-King County and Tri-Valley) accounted for more than half of the state's non-English speaking population in 1980; five SDAs account for 80 percent of the total (those previously mentioned plus Tacoma-Pierce County, Benton-Franklin-Walla Walla, and Pentad). The impact that these populations may have on local dropout goals and services is discussed at greater length in individual SDA reports.

Of the various populations mentioned in this report, perhaps none is more difficult to evaluate than undocumented workers. By reason of their illegal residential status, members of this population are not eligible for JTPA services. Nevertheless, illegal immigrants are counted in the census (although not identified as such) and thus form a part of our population base. Inasmuch as many in this group are economically disadvantaged and do not have the equivalent of a high school education, they undoubtedly have some impact on our estimates of JTPA-eligible school dropouts.

Passell and Woodrow (1984) estimate that there were 22,000 undocumented aliens in Washington in 1980. Of this number, they believe that about 11,000 are from Mexico and another 4,000 are from Asia. If their analysis of the geographic distribution of illegals is correct,

only four states (i.e., California, Texas, Illinois, and Arizona) attract more undocumented aliens from Mexico than does Washington. Passel and Woodrow admit that their figures are intentionally conservative, and our discussions with immigration officials in Washington indicate that the state's undocumented population may be as high as 50,000.

Whatever the actual number, there can be little doubt that this segment of the work force is largely concentrated in a few SDAs. Immigration data from the 1980 census suggest that Seattle-King County, Tacoma-Pierce County, Tri-Valley, Pentad, and Benton-Franklin-Walla Walla are the SDAs that attract the largest numbers of undocumented aliens. The possible impact that members of this population may have on local JTPA services to dropouts is discussed in our reports to the individual SDAs.

VIII. Establishing Goals for Serving Dropouts

A. Defining and Counting School Dropouts

Section 203(b)(3) of the Job Training Partnership Act defines a school dropout as ". . . an individual who is neither attending any school nor subject to a compulsory attendance law and who has not received a secondary school diploma or a certificate from a program of equivalency for such a diploma." The same section establishes the sociodemographic parameters of JTPA-eligible school dropouts as a specific segment of "economically disadvantaged persons sixteen years of age or over in the area."

It would require a separate document to address the various problems and issues inherent in the Act's sparing definition. It does not, for instance, make any distinction between youth and adults, despite obvious differences between unskilled 18-year-olds and middle-aged journeymen; it

does not classify as dropouts those without a diploma who are currently attending trade or basic education classes, and it does not deal with the classification of immigrants from foreign schools. The youth/adult issue is a matter of national consequence and has drawn the attention of formidable spokesmen; most of the lesser issues stir few passions among policymakers and are likely to be ignored.

Two related aspects of the JTPA definition, however, need to be addressed in the state of Washington. These have to do with minimum age and compulsory school attendance. The Act requires SDAs to spend at least 40 percent of their Title IIA funds on services for youth between the ages of 16 and 21. On the other hand, it precludes SDAs from counting as dropouts those youth who are subject to a compulsory attendance law. Washington does, in fact, have a compulsory attendance law; with certain exceptions, youth who have not reached the age of 18 are required to attend school (RCW 28A.27). Thus, SDAs can provide services for economically disadvantaged youth as young as 16, but may not classify them as dropouts until they reach the age of 18.

Since the determination of service goals is based on the percentage of dropouts in the disadvantaged population, employment of the 18-year-old criteria, despite its logical shortcomings, results in a slight reduction of each SDA's service goal. This is because the overall population base remains unchanged (all disadvantaged 16 and over), while the eligible dropout population is reduced. Disadvantaged 16-17 year-old "truants" number about 5,900 in the state and comprise approximately 3.2 percent of all disadvantaged dropouts.

The procedures and suggested service goals discussed in the following section are based on this asymmetry: (1) all economically

disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 21 are treated as a JTPA-eligible population; (2) only those who are 18 years old and over are classified as dropouts.

B. Use of Census Data

Most of the educational attainment data employed in this report were originally gathered and reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. One question that has surfaced on several occasions during this study pertains to the Census Bureau's treatment of high school equivalency certificates.

The 1980 census marked the first time that the Bureau left no doubt that equivalency certificates were to be given the same reporting status as high school diplomas. Item 9 on the census questionnaire asked:

> **9. What is the highest grade (or year) of regular school this person has ever attended?**

Appearing in the same box as that question was the following statement:

> **If high school was finished by equivalency test (GED), mark "12."**

In order to distinguish completers from non-completers, Item 10 on the questionnaire asked:

> **10. Did this person finish the highest grade (or year) attended?**

Although there is no way of knowing how many respondents overlooked the GED-equivalency notation, there is no reason to believe that the number exceeded the normal range of error. The standard error adjustment factors assigned this question by the Census Bureau were, in fact, the same as those assigned responses to occupation and lower than those eliciting individual poverty status. It is our opinion, therefore, that JTPA administrators can be reasonably confident that GED recipients are appropriately accounted for in the census figures.

C. Analysis of Data

In planning for Program Year 1984, the Department of Employment Security analyzed 1980 CPS data from the U.S. Bureau of Census to estimate the number of economically disadvantaged dropouts in each SDA. The resulting estimate was converted to a percentage figure that became each SDA's goal for serving school dropouts. Table 13 shows the results of this analysis. It was found that, statewide, about 35.4 percent of the JTPA-eligible population were school dropouts. Among the SDAs, the percentages ranged from a low of 23.9 percent in the Eastern SDA to a high of 44.2 percent in the Southwest SDA.

As indicated earlier in this report, because a number of SDAs have experienced difficulty in meeting the numerical goals that resulted from the 1984 analysis, SWRL was asked to examine some of the issues involved in establishing equitable goals for serving school dropouts. SWRL's analysis has uncovered a number of factors that should be considered in setting local goals. Among the most important of these factors are the following:

1. Age-composition and distribution. The majority of dropouts are found among the older segments of the population. When the population is grouped according to age (e.g., 16-21, 22-54, etc.), dropout rates are highest among the older age groups and lowest among young age groups. In areas with large numbers of people in a particular age group, dropout rates will be influenced by the age composition of the population.

2. Poverty rates and dropout distribution. Poverty rates have differential effects on various segments of the population. Where poverty rates are relatively small, individuals with the least education and fewest skills will constitute a significant number of those below the poverty line. As poverty rates increase, persons with higher levels of education join the poverty population, thus raising the overall educational level of the economically disadvantaged. This has the counter-intuitive effect of lowering the dropout rate among the economically disadvantaged as the poverty rate increases.

TABLE 13

Estimates of the Disadvantaged Dropout Population, 1984

	SDA	1984 PROJECTIONS Econ. Dis. Pop. (16+)	Dropouts (18+)	Percent
1	Olympic	26,968	9,240	34.26
2	Pacific Mountain	39,292	14,196	36.13
3	Northwest	33,095	9,456	28.57
4	Snohomish	33,562	14,143	42.14
5	Seattle-King	130,218	44,460	34.14
6	Tacoma-Pierce	62,054	21,891	35.28
7	Southwest	30,654	13,547	44.19
8	Pentad	23,948	9,289	38.79
9	Tri-Valley	34,741	13,938	40.12
10	Eastern	19,108	4,566	23.90
11	B-F-WW	18,521	7,932	42.83
12	Spokane	46,356	13,844	29.86
	TOTAL	498,517	176,502	35.41

SOURCE: Washington State Employment Security Department, 1984 JTPA Planning Data by SDA.

To the best of our knowledge, the dynamics of these interacting variables have not been subjected to systematic examination prior to this study. The only survey that provides raw data for all three important variables (age composition, years of school, and poverty status) is that conducted and published periodically by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Their most recent survey was conducted in 1983 and published in 1985 as Consumer Income: Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1983.

While data that provide the same detailed information are not available for the State of Washington, the annual planning data produced by the Employment Security Department provides sufficient information for the construction of a predictive model. Models have been developed for each of Washington's 12 SDAs and are contained in their individual reports. For purposes of illustrating the model, this section will employ aggregated data from all 12 SDAs. The product of this analysis will be a hypothetical service goal for the state as a whole.

Table 14 shows how national and state characteristics differ in important variables and also indicates which of the state characteristics are missing and must be imputed. The comparative data indicate that, while the distribution of age cohorts is similar, the projected 1986 poverty rates for Washington area are substantially higher than the respective national rates were in 1983. On the other hand, the percentage of dropouts below the poverty line is much lower in Washington than was found in the national survey. Although the data for Washington's poverty dropouts are not divided into age groups, the missing values can be estimated through a comparative analysis of age, poverty, and education ratios in the national and state populations. The

TABLE 14

Selected Characteristics of National and Local Dropouts Below the Poverty Line

UNITED STATES (1983)[a]

Age Group	Poverty Population	Distribution	Poverty Rate	Poverty Dropouts	Distribution	Dropout Rate
16-21	4,165,000	18.25	18.06	753,000*	7.29	18.08
22-54	12,534,000	54.93	11.90	5,194,000	50.31	41.44
55+	6,118,000	26.81	12.66	4,378,000	42.40	71.56
TOTAL	22,817,000	100.00	12.91	10,325,000	100.00	45.25

STATE OF WASHINGTON (Projected, 1986)[b]

Age Group	Poverty Population	Distribution	Poverty Rate	Poverty Dropouts	Distribution	Dropout Rate
16-21	83,783	16.30	19.81	---	---	---
22-54	294,875	57.37	14.01	---	---	---
55+	135,352	26.33	15.59	---	---	---
TOTAL	514,010	100.00	15.13	182,003**	100.00	35.41

SOURCES: [a]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Consumer Income: Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1983 (Series P-60, No. 147) (aggregated data), 1985a.

[b]Washington State Employment Security Department, Annual Demographic Information, May, 1985.

*Includes only those youth who are 18 years old and over. See text.

**Based on 1984 dropout rate for economically disadvantaged population.

algorithm used to determine these figures is described more fully in Appendix A.

Table 15 shows the results of our computations. Column 2 is our estimate of the number of JTPA-eligible dropouts in Washington for 1986; column 3 converts these numbers into their respective percentages of the appropriate age-related segments of the poverty population.

Column 4 requires some explanation. Our analyses of both national and state JTPA-service ratios show that, on the average, Title IIA programs serve the various age-groups in approximately the following proportions: ages 16-21, 40 percent; ages 22-54, 58 percent; ages 55+, 2 percent. This verifies the intuitive notion that JTPA has its major appeal among those age-groups that have the highest level of labor force participation. Thus, those in the 22-54 age group are more likely to seek job training than younger or older individuals.

The age-group service averages (column 4) are multiplied by the age-group dropout rates (column 3) to arrive at the dropout-distribution factors shown in column 5. The sum of the three distribution factors (.2543 or 25.4 percent) represents the hypothetical service goal based on the state average.

Of course, most SDAs don't serve participants from the various age groups in precisely these proportions. During the 1984 program year, for example, the percentage of youthful participants ranged from 32 percent in Tri-Valley and Benton-Franklin-Walla Walla to more than 60 percent in Spokane. Since these local service deviations indicate that individual SDAs are attracting participants from age groups with either higher or lower dropout rates, service goals can be adjusted to reflect the

TABLE 15

Computation of
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

STATE OF WASHINGTON

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	83,783	12,231	.1460	.40	.0584	---	---
22-54	294,875	93,914	.3185	.58	.1847	---	---
55+	135,352	75,859	.5605	.02	.0112	---	---
TOTAL	514,010	182,004	.3541	1.00	.2543	---	---

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 25.4%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: --

age-group emphasis of local programs. Table 16 shows two possible baseline goals for each SDA and compares these to their 1984 goal. The 1986 "static" goal employs the state average age distribution, while the 1986 "flexible" goal uses each SDA's age-distribution percentages from 1984-85. Appendix B contains individual SDA data and the specific numerical factors on which these goals are based.

In theory, this procedure permits the adoption of dropout goals for each of three age groups, rather than the adoption of a single goal based on proportionate participation. We do not recommend such a policy for several reasons. First, all of these figures are based on estimates; the intended degree of precision gained by adopting three different goals may be quite illusory, serving only to increase the statistical margin of error. In addition, the adoption of a single percentage figure allows SDAs greater flexibility in intake procedures and reduces the possibility of age-specific recruiting on the part of contractors. We do, however, recommend that SDA planners remain aware of the age distribution of local JTPA participants; a significant change in participant mix may require corresponding changes in future service goals.

D. Adjusting Baseline Goals

In the last section, we referred to our suggested dropout goals as "baseline" goals. We believe that the factors involved in arriving at those goals--age distribution, differential poverty rates, and age-related dropout rates--have a demonstrable impact on JTPA participation in all SDAs. There may, however, be other factors at work in specific SDAs that increase or decrease dropout participation.

TABLE 16

Alternate Dropout Service Goals Elicited
by Static and Flexible Distribution Models

	SDA	1984 Goal	1986 Static Goal*	1986 Flex. Goal**
1	Olympic	34.3	24.4	23.2
2	Pacific Mountain	36.1	24.9	24.2
3	Northwest	28.6	20.3	20.6
4	Snohomish	42.1	30.5	31.2
5	Seattle-King Co.	34.1	24.4	24.9
6	Tacoma-Pierce Co.	35.3	25.9	24.2
7	Southwest	44.2	31.8	31.5
8	Pentad	38.8	26.4	25.4
9	Tri-Valley	40.1	27.5	28.5
10	Eastern	23.9	17.5	18.3
11	B-F-WW	42.8	30.8	32.6
12	Spokane	29.9	21.1	17.7
	STATE TOTAL	35.4	25.4	----

*Assumes "ideal" distribution of participants based on state and national average of 40% youth, 58% adults, 2% older workers.

**Based on each SDA's 1984-85 distribution of participants in youth, adult, and older-worker categories.

In searching for adjustment factors, it is important to keep in mind that any given factor must be significant enough to have a substantial numerical impact on the entire JTPA-eligible dropout population in the SDA. For example, since there are approximately 182,000 economically disadvantaged dropouts in Washington, a factor that would reduce this number by one percent would have to affect some 1,800 individuals. Given the fact that JTPA (Title IIA) programs were able to serve only 3,100 dropouts statewide in 1983-84, it should be apparent that programs and population factors (other than those we have identified) that have a substantial impact on the target population are few indeed.

We have, in earlier sections of this report, pointed briefly to certain factors that may have selective effects. Four of these, in particular, warrant further attention and at the same time, point out some of the problems involved in identifying adjustment data:

1. WIN Programs. Of the 18,582 individuals registered for WIN assistance in September, 1985, almost 7,000 had less than 12 years of education. This represents almost four percent of the economically disadvantaged dropouts in the state. We were unable to obtain SDA-specific data for this report, but it might be useful for each SDA to know the number and service disposition of dropouts registered with WIN in local Job Service offices.

2. Job Corps. According to Job Corps administrators, some 2,000 Washington youth were enrolled in 1984-85. Again, since virtually all of these youth are disadvantaged dropouts, it would help SDAs to know the number enrolled from their respective areas. This information is not readily available at the present time.

3. Immigrants and limited-English-speaking persons. Although we know that there are large numbers of recent immigrants and others with limited-English skills in some SDAs, exact numbers are hard to come by. Even more difficult to assess are the numbers who may be both economically and educationally disadvantaged. While some SDAs are making outstanding efforts to serve these groups, others are hampered by the absence of appropriate ESL programs and personnel.

4. Undocumented aliens. As indicated earlier, estimates of the number of undocumented aliens in the state range from 22,000 to 50,000. It is a reasonable assumption that many of these are both economically and educationally disadvantaged, and that a significant but unknown portion of this population is represented in the dropout counts of various SDAs. It is quite likely that an adjustment factor that accounted for this factor would lead to a goal reduction in some regions.

For each of these areas, appropriate data are not currently available. It is possible that, if it were deemed worthwhile, WIN and Job Corps data could be made available to SDAs. Data pertaining to recent immigrants and those with limited-English skills can be developed and analyzed, but such an effort would probably require time and resources that are beyond the scope of most local SDAs. Research on the numbers and social impact of undocumented aliens is constantly improving, but is still too crude to provide much guidance for local planners.

E. Adjustments for Misreporting by Participants

Task 2 of this inquiry called for the verification of participants' reported educational status in two separate SDAs. This task was prompted by the suggestion that some JTPA applicants may present themselves as high school graduates when, in fact, they are actually dropouts. SWRL subcontracted this aspect of the study to Business, Government, and Community Connections (BGCC), a private research firm in Seattle.

BGCC's final report is presented in its entirety as Appendix C of this report. Their findings and recommendations warrant the attention of both state and local administrators aside from the other issues discussed in this report. However, since their findings also have an important impact on our recommendations pertaining to possible adjustments, we will discuss the pertinent aspects of their study at this point.

Using a stratified sampling technique, BGCC examined and verified the educational status of 196 present and former JTPA participants in the Tacoma-Pierce County SDA and another 134 participants in the Pentad SDA. Briefly stated, they found convincing evidence that from 7-16 percent of participants who report themselves as high school graduates are actually high school dropouts.

Since, to our knowledge, there are no precedents to the BGCC study, we recommend that state JTPA officials in Washington adopt BGCC's lower estimate and permit SDAs to make a 7 percent adjustment for misreporting. That is, it should be assumed that as many as 7 percent of those participants who report having a high school diploma or its equivalent are actually dropouts.

In this same connection, we also believe that the intake procedure in most SDAs is probably inadequate for obtaining accurate responses regarding educational attainment. None of the intake forms that we have seen require applicants to furnish the name and address of schools attended or year of graduation. Some dropouts may thus assume that educational attainment data will not be checked and, hoping to maximize their chances for future placement, misrepresent themselves as high school graduates. By asking for more educational background data at time of intake, SDAs may discourage this practice.

IX. Summary and Recommendations

One of JTPA's several goals is to help economically disadvantaged dropouts qualify for gainful employment. Local SDAs are required to serve an equitable proportion of this group, but frequently have difficulty in meeting their projected goals. SWRL undertook the task of

examining this problem and of assisting SDAs in establishing reasonable goals.

In the course of our study, we identified several factors that appear to determine the pool of economically disadvantaged dropouts that are candidates for JTPA services. Foremost among these factors are age distribution, poverty rates, and local dropout rates. We examined the manner in which these factors interact on the national level, and then developed a model that could be applied to local situations. Our model indicates that not all dropouts are equally likely (or available) to participate in JTPA programs, and that SDAs should be permitted to set goals that reflect the demographic composition of their region.

Our specific recommendations include the following:

1. **Local goals for serving dropouts should be determined through the use of a model that predicts participation/availability pools on the basis of interacting demographic variables (e.g., the SWRL model presented in this report).**

2. **The estimate derived through the use of a demographic model should be considered a "baseline" goal. Further adjustments should be permitted where unique local situations (e.g., large numbers of JTPA-eligible dropouts in a particular program or institution) can be documented and justified.**

3. **Local SDA planners should be periodically informed of the number and demographic characteristics of local residents who are participating in other JTPA programs (e.g., Job Corps, Dislocated Workers, Migrants, Native Americans). This will assist in determining the overall impact of JTPA on the community and on specific target groups.**

4. **If feasible, the number and demographic characteristics of WIN registrants should be determined for each SDA. It is possible that large numbers of some target groups (e.g., dropouts) are obtaining WIN services that make them unavailable to JTPA programs.**

5. **SDA planners should be permitted to make a 7 percent adjustment for misreporting of educational status. Until current intake procedures are changed (see recommendation #6), it should be assumed that 7 percent of the participants classified as high school graduates (but not college attendees) are actually high school dropouts.**

6. Intake forms should be amended to require the name and address of high school(s) attended and the date of graduation. This will enhance follow-up procedures and suggest to applicants that educational attainment may be verified.

7. A study should be undertaken of the present and potential impact of recent immigrants and language minorities on JTPA programs and services. Particular attention should be given (1) their impact on the JTPA-eligible dropout population, and (2) their basic education needs for job training and placement.

8. State-level JTPA administrators should obtain clarification of the state's compulsory attendance law vis-a-vis the definition of a dropout as stated in the Job Training Partnership Act (i.e., the ambiguous status of 16-17 year olds who are not in school).

References

Cook, A. K. (1983). Poverty in Washington. Census Notes, 13. Pullman, WA: Department of Rural Sociology, Washington State University.

Educational Clinics, Inc. (1984). Longitudinal study of former high school dropouts who participated in the ECI program. Seattle, WA.

Passel, J. S., & Woodrow, K. A. (1984). Geographic distribution of undocumented immigrants: Estimates of undocumented aliens counted in the 1980 census by state. International Migration Review, 18, 642-671.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1983). General social and economic characteristics: Washington (PC80-1-C49). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1985a). Consumer income: Characteristics of the population below the poverty level: 1983 (Series P-60, No. 147). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1985b). Education in the United States: 1940-1983 (Special Demographic Analysis, CDS-85-1). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Washington State Commission for Vocational Education. (1985). Annual accountability report: Fiscal year 1984. Olympia, WA. Author.

Washington State Employment Security Department. (1985). Annual demographic information. (12 reports). Olympia, WA. Author.

Washington State Legislative Budget Committee. (1985). Report on educational clinics: Program years 1982-1984 (Report No. 85-7). Olympia, WA. Author.

Washington State Office of Financial Management. (1984). Public common school enrollment forecasts: Washington State 1985-87 Biennial Budget. Olympia, WA. Author.

Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (1984a). Dropout rates and graduation statistics for Washington State school districts: School Year 1982-83. Olympia, WA. Author.

Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (1984b). Washington education directory. Olympia, WA. Author.

Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (1985). Educational alternatives in Washington: A directory (1985 edition). Olympia, WA. Author.

APPENDIX A

A Demographic Model for Establishing Dropout Service Goals

APPENDIX A

A Demographic Model for Establishing Dropout Service Goals

As discussed at some length in our report, we believe that age-distribution and the apportionment of poverty status among age groups are major factors to be considered in assessing the potential participation of economically disadvantaged dropouts in JTPA programs. Consequently, we attempted to gather and analyze current data relating to these variables as they pertain to each SDA.

While the Employment Security Department has produced estimates of the numbers of economically disadvantaged dropouts in each SDA, these estimates treat the below-poverty population as a single entity; they do not discriminate among various age groups. Inquiries regarding the possibility of obtaining age-group estimates have been made to the department's Labor Market and Economic Analysis Branch and to Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory. Analysts at both agencies inform us that SDA-specific population samples are too small to yield reliable information concerning poverty dropouts within particular age groups.

Although local data were insufficient for making calculations, the availability of complete national data for these variables (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1985a) made it possible for us to construct an algorithm that would furnish a reliable estimate of the missing values.

Table A-1 compares national data from 1983 with projected data from Washington for 1986. The missing age-distribution values for Washington are indicated by dashes. Our goal was to estimate the dimensions of the missing values and, and the same time, develop a model for setting dropout service goals. In considering various approaches to this

TABLE A-1

Poverty Status and Educational Attainment
in the United States and Washington

Age Group	Total Population	Poverty Population	Poverty Rate	% Age Distrib.	Poverty Dropouts (18+)	Poverty DO Rate (18+)	Affluent DO Rate (18+)
			United States (1983)[a]				
16-21	23,065,000	4,165,000	18.06	18.25	753,000	18.08	6.89
22-54	105,359,000	12,534,000	11.90	54.93	5,194,000	41.44	14.05
55+	48,324,000	6,118,000	12.66	26.81	4,378,000	71.56	40.21
Total	176,748,000	22,817,000	12.91	100.00	10,325,000	45.25	20.35
			Washington (Projected, 1986)[b]				
16-21	422,998	83,783	19.81	16.30	--	--	--
22-54	2,104,993	294,875	14.01	57.37	--	--	--
55+	868,208	135,352	15.59	26.33	--	--	--
Total	3,396,199	514,010	15.13	100.00	182,003	35.41	--

SOURCES: [a]U.S. Bureau of the Census. Consumer Income: Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1983 (Series P-60, No. 147), 1985.

[b]Washington State Employment Security Department. Annual Demographic Information, May, 1985.

problem, we believed it desirable to develop a model that would not require computer programming or advanced statistical techniques. This would permit replication of the model by those local planners who lack access to the necessary software.

In essence, the model that follows (Table A-2) treats the national population as a tractable matrix and, through a series of steps, molds its age and poverty components to fit local specifications. The model assumes the existence of a linear relationship between relative degrees of wealth (poverty/non-poverty) and education (dropout/graduate) both within and across three age groups. It also assumes that cross-age dropout ratios remain stable for both affluent and disadvantaged dropouts. The model first examines how these components were manifested among various age-related and education-related subgroups of the United States population in 1983, and then predicts how subgroup membership would have changed if the nation's age and poverty patterns were carbon-copies of Washington's projected 1986 population.

In addition to the model, we have provided an addendum that takes the reader step-by-step through the algorithm.

While the following model has been developed for the state population, separate algorithms have been prepared for each SDA, and are contained in each SDA's individual report.

TABLE A-2

Calculation of State Dropout Service Goal

Age Group	(1) U.S. 1983 Population	(2) Washington Projected Poverty Rate	(3) Hypoth. U.S. Pov. Pop. (1x2)	(4) U.S. 1983 Poverty Population	(5) Hypoth. Poverty Increase (3-4)	(6) U.S. 1983 Affluent Dropout Rate	(7) Hypoth. Poverty Dropout Increase (5x6)
16-21	23,065,000	.1981	4,569,177	4,165,000	404,177	.0689	27,848
22-54	105,359,000	.1401	14,760,796	12,534,000	2,226,796	.1405	312,865
55+	48,324,000	.1559	7,533,712	6,118,000	1,415,712	.4021	569,258
Total	176,748,000	.1513	26,863,685	22,817,000	4,046,685	.2035	909,971

Age Group	(8) U.S. 1983 Poverty Dropouts	(9) Hypoth. Poverty Dropouts (7+8)	(10) Hypoth. Poverty DO Rate (9÷3)	(11) Washington % Distrib. Poverty Population	(12) Hypoth. U.S. Total Pov. Pop. (see #3)	(13) Hypoth. Age-Adj. Pov. Pop. (11x12)	(14) Hypoth. Age-Adj. Pov. DOs (10x13)
16-21	753,000	780,848	.1709	.1630	--	4,378,781	748,334
22-54	5,194,000	5,506,865	.3731	.5737	--	15,411,695	5,750,104
55+	4,378,000	4,947,258	.6567	.2633	--	7,073,209	4,644,976
Total	10,325,000	11,234,971	.4182	1.0000	26,863,685	26,863,685	11,143,414

Age Group	(15) % Distrib. Age-Adj. Pov. DOs	(16) Washington Pov. DO Total	(17) Washington Age Distrib. Pov. DOs (15x16)	(18) Washington Projected Poverty Population	(19) Age. Adj. Poverty DO Rate (17÷18)	(20) State JTPA Age Distrib.	(21) Dropout Service Goal (19x20)
16-21	.0672	--	12,231	83,783	.1460	.40	.0584
22-54	.5160	--	93,914	294,875	.3185	.58	.1847
55+	.4168	--	75,859	135,352	.5605	.02	.0112
Total	1.0000	182,003	182,004	514,010	35.41	1.00	.2543

Addendum to Table A-2

1. If each age-group in the U.S. population (Column 1) experienced Washington's corresponding poverty rate (Column 2), the result would be the hypothetical poverty population shown in Column 3.

2. Because of Washington's higher poverty rates, each age group exhibits an increase in membership (Column 5). These figures represent the difference between Columns 3 and 4.

3. Since each group manifests a transfer of individuals from affluence to poverty, we need to know how many of these previously affluent individuals are dropouts. This is accomplished by multiplying the poverty population increase (Column 5) by the affluent dropout rate (Column 6). Column 7 shows the product of this procedure--the number of affluent dropouts joining the poverty population by virtue of an increase in poverty rates.

4. Previously affluent dropouts (Column 7) are added to the fixed number of poverty dropouts (Column 8) to yield the new total of poverty dropouts in our hypothetical population (Column 9).

5. To determine the dropout rates (Column 10) for these hypothetical groups, it is necessary to divide the dropout age-group figures in Column 9 by the corresponding poverty population figures previously obtained and shown in Column 3.

6. In addition to knowing how large the U.S. poverty population would be if the nation as a whole shared Washington's poverty rates, we also need to know how this population would be distributed by age. By applying Washington's 1986 poverty distribution (Column 11) to the hypothetical total shown in Column 3, we obtain the age-adjusted product exhibited in Column 13.

7. We previously determined the poverty dropout rate for our hypothetical population (Column 10). This percentage is now applied to the age-adjusted poverty population (Column 13) to determine total poverty dropouts (Column 14). Each age group's percentage share of the total is shown in Column 15.

8. Since we already have a fixed estimate of the total number of poverty dropouts in Washington (Column 16), we need only distribute this total by the percentages given in Column 15. This procedure yields age-group estimates of the number of poverty dropouts in Washington (Column 17).

9. These age-group estimates (Column 17) are then divided by their corresponding state poverty population projections (Column 18) to obtain the estimated dropout rate for each group (Column 19).

10. Estimated dropout rates (Column 19) are then multiplied by the JTPA participant age-distributions shown in Column 20 to arrive at the products shown in Column 21. The sum of the three age-group products is the recommended service goal.

APPENDIX B

Dropout Adjusted Data
and Recommended Service Goals
for Service Delivery Areas

TABLE B-1

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

OLYMPIC CONSORTIUM

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	4,334	614	.1417	.40	.0567	.464	.0657
22-54	15,674	4,772	.3045	.58	.1766	.524	.1596
55+	8,007	4,212	.5261	.02	.0105	.012	.0063
TOTAL	28,015	9,598	.3426	1.00	.2438	1.000	.2316

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 24.4%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 23.2%

TABLE B-2

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

PACIFIC MOUNTAIN CONSORTIUM

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	6,142	877	.1428	.40	.0571	.435	.0621
22-54	22,425	6,981	.3113	.58	.1806	.549	.1709
55+	11,822	6,735	.5697	.02	.0114	.016	.0091
TOTAL	40,389	14,593	.3613	1.00	.2491	1.000	.2421

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 24.9%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 24.2%

TABLE B-3

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

NORTHWEST WASHINGTON SDA

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	6,269	734	.1171	.40	.0468	.379	.0444
22-54	19,503	4,911	.2518	.58	.1460	.600	.1511
55+	8,583	4,169	.4857	.02	.0097	.021	.0102
TOTAL	34,355	9,814	.2857	1.00	.2025	1.000	.2057

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 20.3%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 20.6%

TABLE B-4

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

SNOHOMISH COUNTY SDA

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	5,187	876	.1689	.40	.0676	.373	.0630
22-54	20,512	7,940	.3871	.58	.2245	.602	.2330
55+	9,298	5,932	.6380	.02	.0128	.025	.0160
TOTAL	34,997	14,748	.4214	1.00	.3049	1.000	.3120

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 30.5%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 31.2%

TABLE B-5

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

SEATTLE-KING COUNTY CONSORTIUM

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	19,197	2,593	.1351	.40	.0540	.363	.0490
22-54	81,227	25,133	.3094	.58	.1795	.622	.1924
55+	33,988	18,162	.5344	.02	.0107	.015	.0080
TOTAL	134,412	45,888	.3414	1.00	.2442	1.000	.2494

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 24.4%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 24.9%

TABLE B-6

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

TACOMA-PIERCE COUNTY CONSORTIUM

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	11,471	1,781	.1553	.40	.0621	.491	.0763
22-54	36,957	11,832	.3202	.58	.1857	.499	.1598
55+	15,553	8,959	.5760	.02	.0115	.010	.0058
TOTAL	63,981	22,572	.3528	1.00	.2593	1.000	.2419

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 25.9%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 24.2%

TABLE B-7

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON CONSORTIUM

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	5,321	929	.1746	.40	.0698	.416	.0726
22-54	18,117	7,313	.4037	.58	.2341	.563	.2273
55+	8,277	5,773	.6975	.02	.0140	.021	.0146
TOTAL	31,715	14,015	.4419	1.00	.3179	1.000	.3145

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 31.8%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 31.5%

TABLE B-8

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

PENTAD CONSORTIUM

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	4,134	616	.1490	.40	.0596	.437	.0651
22-54	13,505	4,461	.3303	.58	.1916	.553	.1827
55+	7,250	4,576	.6312	.02	.0126	.010	.0063
TOTAL	24,889	9,653	.3879	1.00	.2638	1.000	.2541

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 26.4%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 25.4%

TABLE B-9

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

TRI-VALLEY CONSORTIUM

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	5,985	961	.1606	.40	.0642	.324	.0520
22-54	19,297	6,574	.3407	.58	.1976	.669	.2279
55+	10,363	6,765	.6528	.02	.0131	.007	.0046
TOTAL	35,645	14,300	.4012	1.00	.2749	1.000	.2845

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 27.5%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 28.5%

TABLE B-10

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

EASTERN WASHINGTON SDA

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	4,502	475	.1055	.40	.0422	.333	.0351
22-54	10,485	2,239	.2135	.58	.1238	.640	.1366
55+	4,605	1,968	.4274	.02	.0085	.027	.0115
TOTAL	19,592	4,682	.2390	1.00	.1745	1.000	.1832

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 17.5%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 18.3%

TABLE B-11

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

BENTON-FRANKLIN-WALLA WALLA SDA

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	3,020	506	.1675	.40	.0670	.320	.0536
22-54	10,835	4,274	.3945	.58	.2281	.665	.2623
55+	4,832	3,224	.6672	.02	.0133	.015	.0100
TOTAL	18,687	8,004	.4283	1.00	.3084	1.000	.3259

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 30.8%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 32.6%

TABLE B-12

Computation of SDA
Baseline Goal for Dropouts

SPOKANE CONSORTIUM

Age Group	Projected Poverty Population (1)	Projected Poverty Dropouts (2)	Percent of Poverty Population (3)	State Partic. Distrib. (4)	SDA Service Goal (3x4) (5)	SDA 1984 Partic. Distrib. (6)	Alternate Service Goal (3x6) (7)
16-21	8,221	994	.1209	.40	.0484	.603	.0729
22-54	26,338	6,957	.2641	.58	.1531	.394	.1041
55+	12,774	6,182	.4840	.02	.0097	.002	.0000
TOTAL	47,333	14,133	.2986	1.00	.2112	.999	.1770

Baseline Goal Using State Participant Distribution: 21.1%

Baseline Goal Using SDA Participant Distribution: 17.7%

APPENDIX C

Survey of Participant Reported Education Status
Task 2 Final Report

TASK II. SURVEY OF PARTICIPANT REPORTED EDUCATION STATUS OF THE TACOMA COUNTY CONSORTIUM AND THE PENTAD COUNTY CONSORTIUM

Prepared by:

Annie Laurie Armstrong
BGCC
1320 North 40th
Seattle, WA 98103
(206) 547-0120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
Section I:	Statement of Need	1
Section II:	Purpose of Study	2
Section IIIA:	Tacoma-Pierce County Consortium	2
Section IIIB:	Pentad County Consortium	3
Section IVA:	Tacoma PIC Survey Methodology	3
Section IVB:	Pentad PIC Survey Methodology	5
Section VA:	Tacoma PIC Findings	12
Section VB:	Pentad PIC Findings	13
Section VI:	Study Limitations	15
Section VII:	Implications	16
Section VIII:	Recommendations	17

TASK II. SURVEY OF PARTICIPANT REPORTED EDUCATION STATUS

SECTION I: STATEMENT OF NEED

Applicants to JTPA programs are required to report their educational status on application forms. The SDA staff usually do not question the applicant's self-reported education status. The numbers of graduates and dropouts enrolled are based on information provided through participant self-reported education status. There is a possibility that this information may contain inaccuracies. Some applicants may be hesitant to report their status as a dropout, recognizing the limitations that their dropout status may have on potential job opportunities. These individuals may report that they possess a high school diploma or GED. For this reason, the accuracy of the educational status data may be questionable.

The accuracy of the self-reported educational status of applicants is essential for the efficacy of local service goals. Task II. Survey of Participant Reported Education Status was conducted in order to develop a more realistic estimate of the accuracy of the self-reported educational status of applicants.

SECTION II: PURPOSE OF STUDY

Section 203(b)(3) states that JTPA programs will serve dropouts "on an equitable basis, taking into account their proportion of economically disadvantaged persons sixteen years of age or over in the area." In order to document the extent to which the above requirement is being met it is essential that SDA administrators be able to determine the number of dropouts who are currently being served in JTPA programs. TASK II proposes to do the following: (1) Examine the accuracy of participant self-reporting; (2) Estimate the degree of incidence of errors in reporting; (3) Determine the source, if possible, leading to the error in self-reports; (4) Determine the implications of study findings on policy for serving dropouts; (5) Present recommendations for adjusting estimates of dropouts served, and for improving procedures to obtain more accurate data.

SECTION IIIA: TACOMA CONSORTIUM

The Tacoma-Pierce County Consortium was selected to conduct a survey of participant education status because of its urban setting, large number of young dropouts (4,404 between the ages of 16-19 in 1980), and ethnic diversity.

SECTION IIIB: PENTAD CONSORITUM

The Pentad Consortium was selected because it encompasses five rural counties, has a consistently high rate of unemployment, and has the second largest percentage of adult dropouts of the 12 SDA's (39.1 percent between the ages of 18-24, and 30.9 percent of those 25 and over in 1980). The Pentad Consortium encompasses a large segment of the Colville Indian Reservation.

SECTION IVA: SURVEY METHODOLOGY - TACOMA PIC

An MIS printout was provided by Tacoma Private Industry Council listing the following information for 682 participants who self-reported that they graduated from high school or received a GED prior to enrollment in the PIC program:

1. Last Name
2. First Name
3. Middle Initial
4. Date of Birth
5. Social Security Number
6. Race (divided into five categories)
7. Sex
8. Phone Number
9. Phone Number of a Neighbor

Tacoma PIC

This is the population distribution by the categories of race and sex:

	RACE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
1.	White	371	55%
2.	Black	116	17%
3.	Hispanic	49	7%
4.	American Indian	28	4%
5.	Asian	118	17%

	SEX	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
1.	Male	293	43%
2.	Female	387	57%

Sample Selection

A stratified random sample was drawn using a random number generator on an Apple computer. A random sample of 35% of participants was drawn in each of the following ten strata making sure that the race and sex categories were adequately represented in the same proportion as the original population.

1.	White Males	56
2.	Black Males	17
3.	Hispanic Males	7
4.	Native American Males	5
5.	Asian Males	18
6.	White Females	75
7.	Black Females	23
8.	Hispanic Females	10
9.	Native American Females	6
10.	Asian Females	23

The total primary sample contained 240 participants. A 20% sample of 136 people was drawn as a reserve sample observing the same stratification.

The primary sample was sent to the Tacoma PIC to obtain any information they had collected about any participant's school or date of graduation. The Tacoma PIC provided information on approximately half of the sample. The rest of the participants were telephoned to obtain the necessary information.

SECTION IVB: SURVEY METHODOLOGY - PENTAD PIC

The Pentad Private Industry Council provided a listing of the following information for 398 participants:

1. Last Name
2. First Name
3. Age
4. Social Security Number
5. Race (divided into five categories)
6. Sex
7. Phone Number
8. Phone Number of a Neighbor

PENTAD PIC

This is the population distribution of the categories of race and sex:

	RACE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
1.	White	343	86%
2.	Black	4	1%
3.	Hispanic	36	9%
4.	American Indian	12	3%
5.	Asian	3	1%

	SEX	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
1.	Male	134	34%
2.	Female	264	66%

A cross-tabulation by race and sex shows the following population distribution:

		MALE	FEMALE
1.	White	111 (83.0%)	232 (88.0%)
2.	Black		4 (1.5%)
3.	Hispanic	15 (11.0%)	21 (8.0%)
4.	American Indian	6 (5.0%)	6 (2.2%)
5.	Asian	2 (1.0%)	1 (3.0%)

Sample Selection

A stratified random sample was drawn using a random number generator on an Apple computer. A random sample of 70% of participants was drawn in each of the following ten strata making sure that the race and sex categories were adequately represented in the same proportion as the original population.

1.	White Males	78
2.	Black Males	
3.	Hispanic Males	11
4.	Native American Males	4
5.	Asian Males	2
	TOTAL	95
6.	White Females	63
7.	Black Females	3

8.	Hispanic Females	15
9.	Native American Females	4
10.	Asian Females	23
	TOTAL	186

Both the original and the reserve sample were used to obtain information on the 151 participants required in the contract.

Telephone Interviews to Obtain Educational Information

The Tacoma and Pentad participants were contacted by telephone to determine the educational status of the participant upon enrollment in the JTPA program. The participants were asked whether they graduated from high school or received a GED prior to entrance in the JTPA program. The participants provided the names of the educational institution and indicated the years in which they received a diploma or GED. When necessary, bilingual interviewers conducted telephone interviews.

High School Graduation Verification

Participant information regarding the place and date of high school graduation was compiled and sent to the appropriate high schools for verification.

Tacoma PIC

Difficulty in Contacting Tacoma Participants

There were considerable difficulties in reaching participants, as documented below, for the 118 people we were unable to locate:

	CATEGORY	NUMBER NOT REACHED
1.	Neighbor's phone	24
2.	Number disconnected	16
3.	Wrong number/no forwarding number	19
4.	Former employer's number and no referral information	16
5.	Missing number and no referral information	11
6.	No answer with up to ten attempts	11
7.	Moved out of the area/no forwarding number	12
8.	In jail	1
9.	In the military	2
10.	Alcohol rehabilitation	1
11.	Multiple messages left, call not returned	15

Both the original and the reserve sample were used in order to obtain information on the 184 participants required in the contract.

Survey Completion

1. There were 376 participants in the total sample.

2. Information was collected regarding the educational status of 247 (66%) of the total sample.

3. The educational status of 196 (77%) of this group was confirmed.

4. The educational status of 196 (52%) of the total sample of 376 was confirmed.

Pentad PIC

Difficulty in Contacting Participants

There were considerable difficulties in reaching participants, as documented below, for the 118 people we were unable to locate:

	CATEGORY	NUMBER NOT REACHED
1.	Neighbor's phone	35
2.	Number disconnected	20
3.	Wrong number/no forwarding number	28
4.	Former employer's number and no referral information	15
5.	Missing number and no referral information	24
6.	No answer with up to ten attempts	44
7.	Moved out of the area/no forwarding number	25
8.	In the military	4
9.	Multiple messages left/calls not returned	28
10.	Reached participant but was unable to obtain information (Two Hispanic participants were reluctant to provide information; Spanish-speaking interviewers contacted these persons.)	2

11. Reached 5 participants who insisted that they had never been enrolled in a Pentad Consortium or Washington State Security Job Training Program

An attempt was made to verify updated phone numbers for each of the participants by checking phone directories in the Pentad area.

Survey Completion

1. There were 398 participants in the total sample.
2. Information was collected regarding the educational status of 168 (42%) of the total sample.
3. The educational status of 134 (80%) of this group was confirmed.
4. The educational status of 134 (34%) of the total sample of 398 was confirmed.

GED Verification

Staff in the Office of the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction, provided lists of GED recipients. Adults who passed the GED examination were listed. People who were under 19 when they passed the tests had to get clearance from their school districts to be issued a GED or wait until they reached 19 years of age and make a formal request for the GED to be issued. Until the official issuance of the GED, the recipient's name would not appear on the list. Many people never bother to obtain the official GED because the notification of scores shows that they

passed the GED test. Some people who said they had received a GED and were not found on the list may have had a name change, or the name may have been transcribed incorrectly by the PIC, the training institution or the SPI office.

OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

Tacoma PIC

CATEGORY	TOTAL RESPONSES	% OF TOTAL	DISTRIBUTION BY SEX MALE	FEMALE
1. Participant reported GED; report confirmed	89	45%	39 (44%)	50 (56%)
2. Participant reported GED; report unconfirmed	12	6%	3 (25%)	9 (75%)
3. Participant reported high school graduation; report confirmed	63	32%	19 (30%)	44 (70%)
4. Participant reported high school graduation; report unconfirmed (attended school but did not graduate, according to school records)	15	8%	3 (20%)	12 (80%)
5. Participant reported high school graduation; report unconfirmed. (Schools had no record of participant attendance)	14	7%	1 (7%)	13 (93%)
6. Participant reported that	3	2%	2 (67%)	1 (33%)

they had not graduated prior to enrollment in the PIC program			
TOTALS:	196	67	129

Tacoma

	TOTAL SAMPLE	MALE	FEMALE
Number reporting a GED	101	42	59
Percent of confirmed GED's	88%	93%	85%
Percent of unconfirmed GED's	12%	7%	15%
Number reporting high school graduation	92	23	69
Percent confirmed high school graduating self-reports	69%	83%	64%
Percent high school attendees who are non-graduates	16%	13%	17%
Percent of high school self-reports with no records available	15%	4%	19%

OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

Pentad Consortium

CATEGORY	TOTAL RESPONSES	% OF TOTAL	DISTRIBUTION BY SEX MALE	FEMALE
1. Participant reported GED; report confirmed	47	35%	18 (38%)	29 (62%)
2. Participant reported GED; report unconfirmed	11	8%	4 (36%)	7 (64%)
3. Participant	44	33%	10 (23%)	34 (77%)

reported high school graduation; report confirmed				
4. Participant reported high school graduation; report unconfirmed (attended school but did not graduate, according to school records)	9	7%	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
5. Participant reported high school graduation; report unconfirmed. (Schools had no record of participant attendance)	20	15%	3 (15%)	17 (85%)
6. Participant reported that he/she had not graduated prior to enrollment in the PIC program	3	2%	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
TOTALS:	134		39	95

Pentad

	TOTAL SAMPLE	MALE	FEMALE
Number reporting a GED	58	22	36
Percent of confirmed GED's	81%	82%	81%
Percent of unconfirmed GED's	19%	18%	19%
Number reporting high school graduation	73	15	58
Percent confirmed high school graduating self-reports	60%	67%	59%
Percent high school attendees who are non-graduates	12%	13%	12%

Percent of high school self-reports with no records available	28%	20%	29%

SECTION VI: STUDY LIMITATIONS

The following issues should be considered when reviewing the findings in TASK II. Every effort has been made to address the problems identified below. A list of study limitations follows:

1. Verification of Participant Names

   Participants were asked to provide the name they used when they graduated from school. Some individuals were reluctant to disclose information about their names. There is a potential for some individuals to give unintentionally inaccurate information because (a) their name had changed and they may have forgotten which name they used in school; (b) they were enrolled in school under a foster parent name; (c) they were enrolled in school under a maiden name.

2. PIC Management Information System (MIS) Errors

   The errors identified in TASK II findings as participant self-report errors could actually be errors in PIC recordkeeping.

In the information received from the PIC we identified two errors in birthdates and three misspelled names. It is possible that educational status data could be recorded inaccurately on the PIC MIS.

7. Attended School But Never Received Grades

Many schools did not maintain records if students attended the school but never received grades. (This does not affect the number of inaccurate self-reports but does have the potential to raise the number of students who were unknown to the schools where they had reported attendance.

8. School Closures/Name Changes of Schools/Transfer of Records

Every effort was made to identify past school closures and/or name changes and transfer of school records. Nevertheless, these events made the verification difficult.

SECTION VII: IMPLICATIONS

1. There is some indication that the PIC is serving more dropouts than indicated in the PIC Management Information System data.

2. The PIC is serving more dropouts than reported in the PIC MIS because some participants are misreporting their educational status and are stating that they are graduates when they are actually dropouts.

3. The number of dropouts served may need to be adjusted to reflect participant misreporting. Based on a review of participant self-reports of educational status, the Tacoma PIC (sample of 196 participants). The Pentad PIC (sample of 134) participants) serves more dropouts than indicated on the PIC MIS.

4. The degree to which participants are misreporting educational status will be discussed in Section VIII.

SECTION VIII - RECOMMENDATIONS

Errors in Self-Reports of Educational Status

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
Based on the results of the TASK II analysis of participant reported education status, each SDA should adjust its determination of the	1. Some participants are currently reporting that they are high school graduates, when they are actually dropouts. 2. As noted in Section VI, Study

number of dropouts it serves to account for inaccurate reports of participants.

Limitations, there is no way to verify absolutely the self-reported education status of participants. However, the findings in this report may be used to determine a reliable estimate of participant misreporting.

These recommendations are based on the following assumptions:

ASSUMPTION I: Five percent of Tacoma participants reporting a GED are inaccurate.

This estimate is based on the following findings:
Twelve percent of Tacoma participants reporting GED completion were unconfirmed. Seven percent of the reported GED's for men were unconfirmed and 15% of the reported GED's for women were unconfirmed. As noted earlier, name changes for women and, to a lesser extent, for men may explain some of the verification

problems.

Additional verification problems are noted in Section VI. Taking these factors into account, a more conservative estimate of Tacoma participant misreporting of GED status is approximately 5% for men and women combined. This estimate is lower than the 12% indicated in the Findings section of this report. The number was lowered to account for the likelihood of equal misreporting of of responses from men and women and for other factors noted in Section VI. The 3 (2%) of participant reports stating that participants had not graduated prior to enrollment in the JTPA program is included in the above estimate.

ASSUMPTION II: Nine percent of Tacoma participants reporting high school graduation are

inaccurate.

This estimate is based on the following findings:
According to the findings, 31% of Tacoma participants reporting high school completion were confirmed. Of the reports that were unconfirmed, 17% were for men and 36% were for women.

This 9% estimate is lower than the 31% indicated in the Findings section of the report. The number was lowered to account for the likelihood of equal misreporting of responses from men and women and for other factors noted in Section VI.

ASSUMPTION III: Nine percent of Pentad participants reporting a GED are inaccurate.

This estimate is based on the

following findings:

Nineteen percent of Pentad participants reporting GED completion were unconfirmed. Eighteen percent of the reported GED's for men were unconfirmed and 19% of the reported GED's for women were unconfirmed. As noted earlier, name changes for women and, to a lesser extent, for men may explain some of the verification problems. Additional verification problems are noted in Section VI. Taking these factors into account, a more conservative estimate of Pentad participant misreporting of GED status is approximately 9% for men and women combined. This estimate is lower than the 19% indicated in the Findings section of the report. The number was lowered to account for the likelihood of equal misre-

porting of responses from men and women and for other factors noted in Section VI. The three (2%) of participant reports stating that participants had not graduated prior to enrollment in the JTPA program is included in the above estimate.

ASSUMPTION IV: Twenty-three percent of Pentad participants reporting high school graduation are inaccurate.

This estimate is based on the following findings:
According to the findings, 40% of high school Pentad participants reporting completion were unconfirmed. Of the reports that were unconfirmed, 33% were for men and 41% were for women.

The 23% estimate is lower than

	the 40% indicated in the Findings section of the report. The number was lowered to account for the likelihood of equal misreporting of responses from men and women and for other factors noted in Section VI.
RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
OPTION I	
II. Each SDA should adjust its determination of the number of GED's/ high school graduates served by 11% to allow for overreporting errors in participant self-reporting of educational status.	Based on an average of participant self-reporting errors as estimated in Assumptions, I, II, III, and IV.
OPTION II (Refer to III and IV)	
III. Each Urban SDA should adjust its determination of the number of GED's/ high school graduates served by 7% to allow for overreporting errors in participant self-reporting of educational status.	Based on an average of participant self-reporting errors as estimated in Tacoma PIC Assumptions I and II.
IV. Each Rural SDA's should adjust their determination of the number of GED's/high school graduates they serve by 16% to allow for errors in participant	Based on average of participant self-reporting errors as estimated in Pentad PIC Assumptions III and IV.

self-reporting of educational status.

Revise JTPA Application

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
V. The JTPA applications should be revised to include the following information:	The current JTPA application asks:
	What is your current educational status?
(a) Previous name(s) of participants	o school dropout
(b) Date and place of graduation from high school	o student (attend high school or less)
	o high school graduate or equivalent
(c) Date and place of GED graduation	o post-college attendee
(d) Address of school attended	This information is not sufficient to verify the accuracy of participant self-reporting regarding educational status.

Intake

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
VI. Applicants to JTPA programs should be informed during intake that their status as a dropout will not hinder their chances to get a job. Applicants should be informed that employers will not receive the JTPA application information.	Of the 6 participants who reported that they had not graduated from high school or received a GED, 4 participants stated that they neglected to report their dropout status because they were afraid they wouldn't be able to get a job if employers received the information.

Educational Verification Release Form

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
VII. Applicants should be required to sign an educational verification release form.	The use of an educational verification release form could probably increase the accuracy of participant self-reporting of educational status. No follow-up would be necessary to accomplish this goal.

Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI)

Data on GED Acquisition

RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
VIII. The SPI Office should be encouraged to maintain records for students taking GED's who fall into the following categories:	Current GED records at the SPI office are limited only to persons who are issued GED's.

(1) Persons who pass GED's
(2) Persons who fail GED's
(3) Date and location of GED testing
(4) Persons who pass the GED but are too young to be issued a GED without a release form.
(5) Persons who reach full age but neglect to apply for a GED
(6) Persons who are issued GED's